

**REMARKS**

The above claim amendments are submitted along with the following remarks to be fully responsive to the Official Action mailed September 11, 2006. It is further submitted that this response is timely filed within the shortened-statutory period commencing from such mailing date. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Kagan Binder deposit account No. 50-1775 and notify us of the same. Reconsideration of all outstanding grounds of rejection and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,508 to Kaufman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,449 to Blandford. The rejection of claims 19-20 is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action asserts that nothing in the claims references compression of ID values or list in response to Applicant's previous arguments that nothing in the cited prior art teaches or suggests compressed ID values or compressed lists. In response, independent claim 19 is amended to emphasize such compression aspects. Claim 19 is amended to emphasize that the cyclic redundancy check values that are created correspond to a compressed character string representing an authorized user. Additionally, claim 19 is amended to emphasize that calculating a cyclic redundancy check value for a user identification character string is done by compressing the user identification string.

Applicant's previous arguments regarding the non-combinability of the Kaufman and Blandford references are respectfully maintained. Specifically, it is submitted that there is no motivation to combine the Kaufman and Blandford references. The Examiner asserts that one skilled in the art would combine the Kaufman and Blandford references to obtain greater security in data management and concludes the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Kaufman reference relates to computer networks used by many users and not to hand-held devices. There is no motivation for the skilled worker to migrate Kaufman to a compressed approach as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

It is further submitted that even if the Kaufman and Blandford references could be combined, such combination would not provide the invention as claimed. The Kaufman reference does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest comparing compressed ID values to

values in an encrypted and compressed list to determine if an ID value is authorized. Kaufman discloses encryption/decryption of passwords for a conventional personal computer system. In Kaufman, the user list and the inputted user ID are cryptographically hashed, but are not compressed. Kaufman password values are never compared to list values while both kinds of values are compressed. In fact, the Kaufman reference is so deficient, it fails to teach the claimed steps of creating a list of cyclic redundancy check values on a computer, transferring the list to a hand-held data processing device, and determining if the cyclic redundancy check value represents an authorized character string with the hand-held data processing device.

The Blandford reference does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of the Kaufman reference. The Blandford reference relates to archiving data blocks in a computer-based diary and a compressed user ID is never compared to a compressed list of authorized users for authentication purposes as presently claimed. Moreover, the Blandford reference simply does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest creating a list of cyclic redundancy check values on a computer, transferring the list to a hand-held data processing device, and determining if the cyclic redundancy check value represents an authorized character string with the hand-held data processing device as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

It is therefore submitted that presently pending claims are currently in condition for allowance, a notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner finds any issue remaining after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, at the Examiner's convenience, in order to expedite any remaining prosecution.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 11, 2006

By:



Kevin J. Hubbard, Reg. No. 50,717

**Customer Number 33072**

Phone: 651-275-9813

Facsimile: (651) 351-2954